

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
3 MARSHALL DIVISION
4 ULTRAVISION TECHNOLOGIES,) (
5 LLC,) (CIVIL ACTION NO.
6 PLAINTIFF,) (2:18-CV-100-JRG-RSP
7 VS.) (TYLER, TEXAS
8) (
9 GOVISION, LLC, ET AL.,) (MAY 20, 2019
10 DEFENDANTS.) (9:12 A.M.

11 SCHEDULING CONFERENCE
12 BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE RODNEY GILSTRAP
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14 APPEARANCES:

15

16 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: (See Attorney Attendance Sheet docketed
17 in minutes of this hearing.)

18 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: (See Attorney Attendance Sheet docketed
19 in minutes of this hearing.)

20 COURT REPORTER: Shelly Holmes, CSR, TCRR
21 Official Court Reporter
22 United States District Court
23 Eastern District of Texas
24 Marshall Division
 100 E. Houston
 Marshall, Texas 75670
 (903) 923-7464

25 (Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
produced on a CAT system.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

May 20, 2019

Page

Appearances	1
Hearing	3
Court Reporter's Certificate	9

1 THE COURT: Next I have a series of consolidated
2 cases. The lead case is Ultravision Technologies versus
3 GoVision, LLC, Case No. 2:18-CV-01 -- excuse me, 0100.
4 This is the designated lead case, although I understand it
5 has subsequently been dismissed. Consolidated together,
6 though, with these cases include Case No. 2:18-CV-099,
7 Ultravision Technologies versus Glux Visual Effects Tech;
8 also consolidated with it is Case No. 2:18-CV-102,
9 Ultravision -- Ultravision Technologies versus Leyard
10 Optoelectronic Company, et al.; also consolidated as a part
11 of these cases is 2:18-CV-103, Ultravision Technologies
12 versus Shenzhen Liantronics Company, Ltd; also consolidated
13 with it is 2:18-CV-108, Ultravision Technologies versus
14 Prismaflex International France S.A., and Prismaflex USA,
15 Inc.; also consolidated with it is 2:18-CV-112, Ultravision
16 Technologies versus Shenzhen Absen Optoelectronic Company,
17 Ltd. and Absen, Inc.; also consolidated with it is case
18 2:18-CV-113, Ultravision Technologies versus Shenzhen AOTO
19 Electronics and AOTO Electronics US; also consolidated with
20 it is Case No. 2:18-CV-116, Ultravision Technologies versus
21 Unilumin Group and Unilumin LED Technologies; and also
22 consolidated with it is 2:18-CV-118, Ultravision
23 Technologies versus Yaham Optoelectronics Company, Limited,
24 and LED USA, Inc.

25 All right. In regard to this series of

1 consolidated cases, what's the announcement from Plaintiff,
2 Ultravision Technologies?

3 MR. BAXTER: For the Plaintiff, Your Honor, Sam
4 Baxter. We do not consent, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: All right. Let's begin with the
6 various Defendants starting with Glux Visual Effects Tech.

7 MR. YARBROUGH: Your Honor, Trey Yarbrough. To
8 inform the Court, Glux Visual Effects Tech, to our
9 knowledge, has never been served.

10 THE COURT: All right. In addition to that
11 statement, are you here to make an announcement for them,
12 Mr. Yarbrough?

13 MR. YARBROUGH: No, Your Honor, other than to
14 convey that information.

15 THE COURT: All right. Let's go through the
16 remaining Defendants and see what the status of those are.
17 What's the announcement from Leyard Optoelectronic
18 Company?

19 MR. YARBROUGH: Your Honor, Trey Yarbrough, and I
20 would have the same announcement or conveyance of
21 information on behalf of Leyard. To our knowledge, they
22 have not been served.

23 THE COURT: And next is Shenzhen Liantronics
24 Company.

25 MR. YARBROUGH: Your --

1 THE COURT: Is that your --

2 MR. YARBROUGH: Excuse me, Your Honor.

3 Trey Yarbrough on behalf of Shenzhen Liantronics
4 and Liantronics LLC, and to our knowledge, neither of those
5 Defendants have been served.

6 THE COURT: All right. The next set of Defendants
7 would be Prismaflex International and Prismaflex USA.

8 MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, Joshua Davis on behalf of
9 the Prismaflex Defendants. We do not consent.

10 THE COURT: All right. Shenzhen Absen
11 Optoelectronic Company and Absen, Inc.?

12 MS. SMITH: Your Honor, Melissa Smith on Shenzhen
13 Absen and Absen, Inc. We do not consent.

14 THE COURT: All right. The next Defendants
15 include Shenzhen AOTO Electronics and AOTO Electronics U.S.

16 MR. YARBROUGH: Your Honor, Trey Yarbrough on
17 behalf of AOTO Electronics US LLC. We do not consent.

18 With respect to Shenzhen AOTO Electronics Company
19 Limited, to our knowledge, they have not been served.

20 THE COURT: All right. What about Unilumin Group
21 and Unilumin LED?

22 MR. YARBROUGH: Your Honor, Trey Yarbrough on
23 behalf of Unilumin LED Technology Florida, LLC, we do not
24 consent.

25 With respect to Unilumin Group Company Limited,

1 Your Honor, to our knowledge, they have not been served.

2 THE COURT: And what about Yaham Optoelectronics
3 Company and Yaham LED USA, do we have an announcement?

4 Any here -- anyone here from Orrick Herrington
5 and Sutcliffe? They appear to be the counsel listed of
6 record.

7 Well, we've got some Defendants who apparently
8 have not been served, some who have been and announced, and
9 somebody that didn't show up. Let's see if we can figure
10 this out.

11 Mr. Baxter, can you enlighten the Court as to the
12 status of these various Defendants from the Plaintiff's
13 standpoint.

14 MR. BAXTER: Your Honor, it's my understanding and
15 my belief that some of those Defendants have been served,
16 but I'll need to double-check and let the Court know.

17 THE COURT: Does anyone have any information about
18 the Yaham Defendants and why there's not an appearance or
19 announcement this morning on their behalf?

20 MR. YARBROUGH: Your Honor, Trey Yarbrough. May I
21 provide the Court with a little more detail?

22 With respect to Unilumin Group Company Limited,
23 which is a Chinese company, my understanding is that some
24 agency of the government has been served, but it's not
25 effective service on the company.

1 With respect to the others that I identified for
2 the Court, we are not aware, have no knowledge of there
3 being any service at all. I simply wanted to give the
4 Court more detail.

5 THE COURT: All right. Well, confronted with
6 what's before the Court this morning, my intention is to go
7 ahead and proceed with scheduling.

8 If we have Defendants who have not been
9 effectively served or that service is somewhere between
10 here and what foreign shores they may reside upon, the
11 Court will certainly be open to request to readdress the
12 deadlines once those remaining Defendants are active in the
13 case.

14 But I'm not going to -- I'm not going to fail to
15 schedule the case this morning given that we do have
16 clearly Defendants who are here and have -- have answered
17 and responded and are appropriate for scheduling.

18 This looks like it's somewhat of a mixed bag in
19 that regard, and my intention is to go ahead and proceed
20 with scheduling with an understanding that we may have to
21 make adjustments for these other Defendants as they come
22 into the case. I think that's the best course forward at
23 this juncture, given where we are.

24 All right. Thank you, Mr. Yarbrough.

25 (The following portion was held later in the

1 scheduling conference.)

2 THE COURT: And in the Ultravision Technologies
3 cases, as consolidated, with the various Defendants as
4 called, including cases ending in 099, 102, 103, 108, 112,
5 113, 116, and 118, claim construction is set in each of
6 those cases for January the 29th, 2020 before Magistrate
7 Judge Payne, jury selection is set in each of those cases
8 before me on August the 17th, 2020.

9 (Hearing concluded.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the stenographic notes of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my ability.

/s/ Shelly Holmes
SHELLY HOLMES, CSR, TCRR
OFFICIAL REPORTER
State of Texas No.: 7804
Expiration Date: 12/31/20

5/30/19
Date